



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/685,038	10/14/2003	Raj Mahadevaiah	18210.3	4878

25854 7590 07/28/2005

BRYAN W. BOCKHOP, ESQ.
2375 MOSSY BRANCH DR.
SNELLVILLE, GA 30078

EXAMINER

SINGH, RAMNANDAN P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2646

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/685,038

Applicant(s)

MAHADEVAIAH, RAJ

Examiner

Ramnandan Singh

Art Unit

2646

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 1 and 9 are objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 1, line 5, "a incoming telephone call" is incorrect.

In claim 1, line 9, "a incoming telephone call" is incorrect.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claim1-5, 9-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by O'Brien [US 4,893,329].

Regarding claim 1, O'Brien teaches an apparatus for intercepting telephone calls on a telephone channel connected to a telephone [col. 1, lines 7-17; col. 1, lines 30-42; Abstract], as shown in Fig. 1, comprising:

a ring detector (12), in communication with the telephone channel, that is capable of detecting an incoming telephone call and that generates a ring signal upon detection of a incoming telephone call [Fig. 1; col. 3, lines 4-17];

a user input device (i.e. key pad of a telephone set) that is capable of receiving

an input from a user indicating that the user desires not to be called [col. 2, lines 15-22; col. 7, lines 11-23; Figs. 1-2];

a counter (i.e. timer 72), responsive to the user input, programmed to count a selected amount of time from assertion of the user input [col. 5, lines 44-53]; and

a delay circuit (i.e. microcontroller (14) , responsive to the counter, the ring signal and the user input, that is programmed to [col. 5, lines 44-53; col. 7, lines 1-44; Figs. 3, 7] :

allow the telephone to ring (i.e. **normal mode** operation) if an incoming call has been detected and if more than the selected amount of time has passed since the user input was last asserted [col. 7, lines 7-10; col. 2, lines 3-14; Figs. 4-7]; and

prevent the telephone from ringing (i.e. **defer mode** operation) if an incoming call has been detected and if less than the selected amount of time has passed since the user input was last asserted [col. 7, lines 4-7; col. 2, lines 3-14; Figs. 4-7].

Claim 9 is essentially similar to claim 1 and is rejected for the reasons stated above.

Regarding claim 2, O'Brien further teaches the apparatus comprising:
a telephone selection circuit, operatively coupled to a plurality of telephones, that includes a user input that indicates to the controller which of the plurality of telephones are to have ringing inhibited [col. 1, lines 43-56].

Regarding claim 3, O'Brien further teaches the apparatus comprising a message playback circuit (i.e. voice synthesizer 16), responsive to the controller, that plays a message to an incoming caller when the controller inhibits ringing of the telephone [Fig. 1; col. 2, lines 3-14; col. 8, lines 44-52];

Regarding claim 4, O'Brien further teaches the apparatus comprising a visual incoming call indicator that provides a visual indication (i.e. LED) that a telephone call is incoming while the telephone inhibited from ringing [col. 3, lines 18-26].

Regarding claim 5, O'Brien further teaches the apparatus, wherein the visual incoming call indicator comprises an indicator light (i.e. light emitting diode (LED)) [col. 3, lines 18-26].

Regarding claims 10-12, the limitations are shown above.

Regarding claim 13, O'Brien further teaches the method, wherein the determining step is completed by a circuit that is integrated into the telephone [col. 5, lines 23-43].

Regarding claim 14, O'Brien further teaches the method, wherein the determining step is completed by a circuit controlled by a telephone exchange carrier (i.e. Central Office) [Fig. 8; col. 2, lines 33-41].

Regarding claim 15, O'Brien further teaches the method the steps of: a. receiving from a user an input of at least one selected caller telephone number;

storing the telephone number in a memory;

upon receiving an incoming telephone call, comparing an incoming number corresponding to the incoming telephone call to the selected caller telephone number stored in the memory; and

if the incoming number matches the selected caller telephone number then executing a first action (i.e. normal mode), otherwise executing a second action (i.e. defer mode) different from the first action [col. 7, lines 4-7; col. 2, lines 3-14; Figs. 4-7].

Regarding claims 16-17, the limitations are shown above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Brien as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Gordon et al [US 5,459,584].

Regarding claim 6, O'Brien does not teach expressly a video display generator and a video display circuit.

Gordon et al teaches, a **video display generator 199** and a RF modulator suitable for supplying a display signal shown in Fig. 9, wherein the primary function of the processor is to **intercept incoming calls** [col. 16, lines 41-53; col. 19, lines 5-8] ; and a **text message is generated** using the **keypad 196** in conjunction with **processor (195)** relating to a **telephone call** destined for the user of the telephone [Fig. 9; col. 16, line 25 to col. 17, line 5; col. 18, lines 64 to col. 19, 17].

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to Gordon et al with O'Brien in order to provide an alternative to a paperless terminal [Gordon et al; col. 16, lines 41-43].

Regarding claims 7-8, the limitations are shown above.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Fuller et al [US 4,893,335] teach call screening using a programmed control system [Abstract].

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramnandan Singh whose telephone number is (571) 272-7529. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH (8:00-5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sinh Tran can be reached on (571) 272-7564. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ramnandan Singh
Examiner
Art Unit 2646



SINH TRAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER